

Dec. 27. 2006 1:32PM INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ PC

No. 6016 RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. DEC 27 2006**

7150 E. CAMELBACK, SUITE 325

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251

Telephone: (480) 385-5060

Faxsimile: (480) 385-5061

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

TO:	FROM:
Examiner M. Luu	Paul D. Amrozowicz, Reg. No. 45,264 <i>(AD)</i>
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	DECEMBER 27, 2006
FACSIMILE NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571-273-8300	4
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	H0004368
RE:	RECIPIENTS REFERENCE NUMBER:
Response	10/650,008

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

**FORMAL COMMUNICATION INTENDED FOR  
ENTRY**

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

DEC 27 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

5

In re application of: David B. DWYER

Group Art Unit: 3663

Serial No.: 10/650,008

Examiner: M. Luu

Filed: August 26, 2003

Confirmation No.: 6065

10 For: INTEGRATED FLIGHT MANAGEMENT AND TEXTUAL AIRCRAFT  
TRAFFIC CONTROL DISPLAY SYSTEM AND METHOD

Docket No.: H0004368

Customer No.: 000128

15

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

on December 27, 2006.

Signature:

Paul D. Amrbowicz

REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.41

20

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 in response to an Examiner's Answer mailed November 27, 2006. Each of the topics in the Examiner's Answer for which a response is supplied herein are indicated using appropriate subheadings on the following pages. This

30 Reply Brief does not include any new or non-admitted amendment, or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence. As such, Appellant submits it is in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.41(a).

I. THE EXAMINER'S CONTINUED REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 COMPLETELY IGNORES POSITIVELY RECITED FEATURES THAT ARE NOT MERE STATEMENTS OF INTENDED USE

5 In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner continues to erroneously allege that the claims merely recite statements of intended use or field of use, such as "operable to," adapted to," and "capable of" in making the § 102 rejection. In doing so, the Examiner wholly, and erroneously, ignores features explicitly recited in the claims. In particular, the Examiner's Answer states that the processor being "adapted to receive" the recited data is merely intended use, and accords this 10 no patentable weight. The Examiner's Answer then goes on to allege that Decker et al. discloses a processor that is operable to supply flight plan display commands and clearance message display commands. Quite significantly, however, the Examiner's analysis places emphasis on the words "operable to" and completely ignores the recitation that the processor is "operable, in response [to the received data and textual clearance message signals], to supply one or more 15 flight plan display commands and one or more clearance message display commands." Thus, while Appellant certainly does not concede that Decker et al. discloses all that the Examiner alleges it does, Appellant does submit that Decker et al. fails to disclose (or even remotely suggest) at least a processor that is operable, in response to data representative of a current flight plan and textual clearance message signals, to supply one or more flight plan display commands 20 and one or more clearance message display commands. The fact is, the Examiner has not and cannot point to any teaching or disclosure of this feature, which is why, Appellant submits, the Examiner erroneously ignores this feature and puts misplaced reliance on the language being mere recitation of intended use.

25

II. THE EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT SECTION IS WHOLLY ERRONEOUS AND IS NOT SUPPORTED BY STATUTE OR CASE LAW

30 In the "Response to Argument" section of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner erroneously alleges that the claims merely recite a processor that is "adapted to" or "capable of" performing a function. Examiner's Answer at 14. Moreover, the Examiner erroneously relies on the proposition espoused in In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997), that a claim that recites a new intended use for an old product does not render a claim to the old

DEC 27 2006

product patentable. Id. As delineated above, the claims on appeal do not recite a "new intended use" for a processor. Rather, the claims recite a specifically configured processor. In particular, a processor that is operable, in response to the receipt of specified data and signals, to supply specific display commands. As the Board may appreciate, according to the Examiner's line of reasoning, absolutely no processor controlled device could ever be patentable. Such a line of reasoning is clearly not supported by statute or case law.

### III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellant once again submits that the final rejection of Claims 1-12 is improper and should not be sustained. Appellants also repeat its earlier request for a reversal of the rejections in the final Office Action dated June 2, 2006.

15

Dated December 27, 2006

20

Respectfully submitted,

Paul D. Amrozovicz  
Registration No. 45,264